

# House of Commons Debates

FOURTH SESSION—SIXTH PARLIAMENT.

## SPEECH OF MR. DALTON McCARTHY, M.P., ON THE FRENCH LANGUAGE IN THE NORTH-WEST.

TUESDAY, 18TH FEBRUARY, 1890.

Mr. McCARTHY. I think it is not unreasonable that, at this hour, I should claim the indulgence of the House. The debate has lasted over five days, or nearly so, and during that time I have been subjected to as much abuse certainly as the rules of Parliament permit, and perhaps a little more than the rules would warrant. I look at my friends who are opposite to me and I find no sympathetic glances, and I have no reason to expect them. I look to the band of Nationalists who think I am assailing their race and nationality and language, and I do not find any and I do not expect any. And even when I look amongst those on this side who were once my friends and allies, I find, perhaps, more hostile glances than I do elsewhere. I am standing here alone, or almost alone, doing what I believe to be my duty, and, notwithstanding the sneers, and the taunts, and the insinuations that have been made, I propose to do my duty to the end, if I stand alone, or almost alone, on the floor of this House in the vote which is shortly to be taken. The hon. gentleman who has last spoken (Sir Richard Cartwright) has made no disguise of his feelings or his principles. He speaks not from the principle of statesmanship but from a purely partisan or party point of view. He argues with his friends behind him and his friends before him on that ground, and he appeals to them not to fall into the trap which I am accused of having laid and which some of those friends, he thinks, have already fallen into, but to reject the Bill which I have had the honor to introduce. He makes this appeal without one word of argument upon the merits of the Bill, without a word as to whether it is right or wrong in the interests of the people of the North-West, for whom we are here to judge and to legislate upon this question, but simply with a view to the effect it may have on the votes of the people whom he thinks he leads from the Province of Ontario. He warns them as to the results. He knows well enough that they have gone away from him never to return, but he tells them that they will have lost all if they

support such a measure as this and had better return to their allegiance. I looked for better things from that hon. gentleman, but have looked in vain. His speech was a purely partisan speech, without one redeeming feature, without one thing to raise it above the level of the mere party machine. I welcome his statement even from a party point of view if from no other, because it leaves that hon. gentleman without a shred of reputation as a statesman, which he once pretended to be. But I have to address myself not only to the hon. gentleman from South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright). I have to speak of the attack which has been made upon the measure from other sources, and to endeavor to clear up, if I can, the accusations which have been made. The hon. members who have supported me are small in number, though they are as true as steel. They have been overborne in this debate by the power of numbers—not of argument; and I will endeavor to show that, amid the tissue of misrepresentation which has been poured out upon our devoted heads, hon. members will find that there has been no warrant for any part of it. I am accused of having got up this agitation, of having originated it not only on matters of race, but on matters of religion, and I am accused of doing that for selfish purposes and ends. I would like to know what end I had to serve in severing myself from the gentleman I have hitherto supported, and from those hon. gentlemen behind me, who, I have reason to believe, would not have been unwilling to see me advanced in the ranks of my party. What could have led me to take this course as it has been untruly represented to the House, and through the House to the country? My whole course in regard to this matter did not originate last July in my address to my constituents. But on the floor of this chamber, in the presence of hon. members who hear me now, I stated that I had discovered—as, I am ashamed to say, I discovered for the first time—that the dual language clause was in the North-West Act. We then talked it over, and I appeal to the hon. member

for West Assiniboina (Mr. Davin) if we did not call him across the floor and ask him how it was, as our attention had been called to the subject by a speech having been delivered by a Lieutenant Governor of the North West Territories, for the first time, in French, in the preceding session. That is what aroused our attention to this fact, and, if I am not misinformed, that is what first drew attention to the fact in the North West, that a French Governor who was sent up there to govern what was practically an English speaking people, true, Sir, to the policy of his race, true to the object which my hon. friends from Quebec have had in view from the very first day that this country was ceded to Great Britain, namely, to perpetuate their race; and they know full well, if other hon. members choose to disregard it, that the perpetuation of that race can only be by the perpetuation of their language. I say, knowing that the Lieutenant Governor of the North West delivered there his speech in French and English, and imported into that Territory a secretary, in order that the laws might be translated into French and published in that language. This, Sir, it was, if I am not grossly misinformed, which raised the indignation of the members of the Legislative Assembly of the North West so much that they threatened, if that occurred again, they would withdraw in a body. Well, Sir, whether that be so or not, so far as I am concerned it was as I have stated. I consulted some of the hon. gentlemen who are sitting about me and we agreed some of these hon. gentlemen have been true to their pledges, but the voices of some others have been stifled because they feared to hurt their party, we then and there pledged ourselves that we would, at the earliest opportunity, bring to the notice of this House the iniquitous legislation which the hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills) had fathered, which he pretended he had acquiesced in reluctantly, but, as it now appears, he had deliberately committed at its introduction into the Act of the North West Territories in the year 1878. That was the beginning of it, and I notified my leader at an early day that I would take this course. I had nothing to do with the agitation in connection with it. The agitation which has been spoken of with regard to the Equal Rights Association got no strength from my connection with it. I had never even attended the convention which assembled at Toronto: all I had to do with it was to send a telegram of regret that I was unable to attend, being otherwise engaged in professional duties, and that I sympathised with the motives and the objects which had brought together the great band of people from all parts of Ontario to take such measures that for the future, at all events, their voice should be heard on the floor of this Parliament. When it became my duty to visit my constituents, as I did upon the 12th July the first time, I may state, that I ever addressed a body of my constituents on that day, or made any political utterance on the 12th July. I then announced publicly, that I would take the earliest opportunity of asking this Parliament to undo what, according to the records, I will not use the word "surreptitiously" - but what, according to the records, had been stolen through in the dying hours of the Session of 1878, under the charge of the hon. member for Bothwell. Was that an agitation of which any man need be ashamed? Was

that pandering to the already aroused passions? What followed? It is said that I have undertaken to act for the people of the North West Territories; that no mission has been given me so to act for them, and that I am an intruder. Sir, when it became known that I purposed to take my holidays in the North West, I was invited to address meetings throughout the Province of Manitoba. I had to decline to do so, except at one place, which, ultimately, was fixed for me, at Portage la Prairie.

Mr. WATSON. A Conservative centre.

Mr. McCARTHY. When I got to Portage la Prairie, and was on my way up to the North-West, it was not that I was seeking to intrude myself upon the domain of the North-West, but my difficulty was to deny myself to those who desired that I should address them and in the end I merely addressed one meeting, and that was at Calgary. I refused to make addresses in British Columbia, only to find on the next morning that the newspapers abused me for passing them by. I refused to address a meeting at Winnipeg, only to find that I was subject to castigation for passing by the important centre of that Province. The hon. member says I spoke at a Conservative centre. He knows pretty well, I think, he will be honest enough to admit, that the choice of place for holding the meeting, which happened to be at Portage la Prairie, was not my choice; but when I stated, as I did state, that I would only deliver one address in the North-West, and those who invited me fixed on Portage la Prairie as the place of the meeting, and I had no choice in the matter, one way or the other. I know the charge was made that it was chosen, because it was in a constituency represented by the hon. member who has just made the interruption, but I think that hon. member will do me the justice to say that, at all events, that charge was not founded so far as I am concerned. The charge has also been made that I was playing the game of the First Minister, that I was a mere tool in his hands, that I was going through this country without being smitten in my pledges, that in what I stated I was carrying on an agitation in collusion with him. Sir, I do not think that charge was even worthy of contradiction, as it ought to be denounced, but it is a charge which I now take the opportunity, in the presence of the First Minister, to say, as every hon. member on the floor of this House must realise, was certainly wanting in a tittle of foundation. I did what I thought was honorable and fair by this hon. gentleman whom I have hitherto followed. I have been careful to hold no intercourse with my former leader, my still leader in all questions affecting the general policy of the country.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh, Oh. Hear, hear.

Mr. McCARTHY. Yes; I am not ashamed to announce this fact. There is no reason why I should cross the floor of this House, for there is, in my judgment, on that side an inability and an unwillingness to grapple with the questions which are looming up, and which call for settlement, and I find a bigotry still more profound upon the other side, a still greater truckling to that which, as every man from the Province of Ontario knows, I propose to devote the rest of my political life to

denounce, and, if possible, to overturn. Therefore, why should I cross the floor of the House and follow the banner of hon. gentlemen opposite? I took an opportunity long ago of stating exactly where I stood. I spoke in the Opera House in this city. I do not know whether the First Minister took the trouble of reading it, but it was there for him to read. I stated then exactly where I stood. I stated that when these questions came up, if my party differed from the view which ought to be taken, I must stand alone, and I must follow these questions to their end. On other questions I stated there, as I have stated elsewhere, that as I was elected a supporter of the general policy of the Government, I was still a supporter of, and still a believer in that policy. If my connection with the party that I have hitherto supported is an injury to that party, as I think perhaps it is, if the gentlemen who sit behind me do not want me here, I am willing to go here or there, I care not where. I think I can find a seat in this House, and I can still voice the opinions of my own constituency, and a large proportion of the people of Ontario, whether I am turned out of this party or not, and whether I am accepted in that party or not. Such has been my course, and I am not ashamed of it. I denounce that man as a traitor to his country, I care not who he may be, who endeavors to arouse political passions and race passions by misrepresenting my views; he is the man who is doing the wrong, he is the man who is endeavoring in this Parliament and in this country to set race against race and religion against religion, because if my views are fairly looked at, if my statements are fairly examined, if my speeches are fairly read, I think no taint of bitterness will be found, because no taint of bitterness exists, towards my French Canadian fellow-citizens.

An hon. MEMBER. Oh, oh.

Mr. McCARTHY. The hon. gentleman may laugh, but he must know that I have a perfect right to the opinion which I entertain, that the best interests of this country are to be subserved by a unity of language, that the future of this great Dominion, with which this Parliament is charged, will be best worked out by the people of this country coming together and speaking the language of the majority, the tongue that ultimately must be spoken on all this continent of North America. And, if I am right in that, I do no injustice to my Canadian fellow-subjects: I do only what is my right and my duty, if among those hon. gentlemen and their constituents I endeavor to propagate my views and to support those views by arguments. I frankly admit, I do not deny it, that to many of these hon. gentlemen these are unpalatable views; but is that any good reason why, if I do think, and there are many who think with me, I should hesitate upon the floor of Parliament in temperate language, and my language was temperate, to express these views.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. McCARTHY. My language, I re-assert, was temperate, and I will refer to it to support these views. My language was temperate whenever I spoke, and it was more especially temperate on the floor of Parliament, as an hon. gentleman's language ought to be temperate here. No such

words escaped my lips as those which the Secretary of State used towards me here to-day; no language of that kind has ever escaped my lips in this debate, and I trust, notwithstanding the provocation of the Minister of Public Works, notwithstanding the provocation I received from the Secretary of State, who denounced me in language not fit for this Assembly, I trust no word will escape my lips which will resemble those used in the course they have pursued towards me. My arguments may tend to a certain conclusion, but my tone was temperate, and I venture to say that my argument was fairly drawn. Now, what was it? I ventured, in the first place, to give a short account of the history of this legislation. I ventured, in the second place, to demonstrate, what I am glad to know I did succeed in demonstrating beyond the region of contradiction, that the French language was not, according to any treaty rights, to be given, if you choose to call it so, to be made a part of the system in the North-West Territory. For that purpose it was necessary that I should trace the history of the cession. I was sorry I introduced even the word conquest, if it was offensive to any hon. gentleman, and I am quite willing to put the fact in any words, although most men will admit that the words make very little difference when the history is known to us all. I said, tracing that history step by step from the cession of 1763 to the passage of the British North America Act in 1867, that no word was to be found in all that history to show why that Act was passed, for which the hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills) is responsible, which was represented in that day to the House, but which I am sorry to say was not fairly or correctly represented to the House at that time, by the hon. gentleman, as a piece of legislation warranted upon a ground of that kind. My next argument, and I think it was a not unreasonable one, was this.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). The hon. gentleman was himself a member of the House.

Mr. McCARTHY. I am not at all unaware of that fact. What I repeat is, that the matter was misrepresented to this House.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). In what way?

Mr. McCARTHY. By the hon. member for Bothwell.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). I deny it.

Mr. McCARTHY. I will tell the hon. gentleman in what way. That legislation was introduced into the Senate upon the suggestion of Mr. Girard, the Senator for Manitoba, but it was placed there by the member of the Government leading the Senate, Hon. Mr. Scott.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). I do not believe it.

Mr. McCARTHY. I have better information than the hon. gentleman, and, therefore, I shall not withdraw my statement. I speak by the book: I speak on the authority of a gentleman who was present; I speak in a way I can prove. I can prove that Senator Girard merely asked that some provision should be made by which the French half-breeds would have the right to speak in their own language in the courts; and the matter was taken into consideration by Hon. Mr. Scott.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. That is not the only thing that was asked.

Mr. McCARTHY. That is correct according to my information, and it is probably quite as good as that possessed by the Secretary of State.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh, oh.

Mr. McCARTHY. I have sat for five days in this House listening to this debate. I have been abused by almost every hon. gentleman who has spoken, but I have made no interruption. It is strange that if with ten to one against me they cannot give me even free speech.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. You stated as a fact that which was not correct.

Mr. McCARTHY. Whether correct or not, the hon. gentleman knows the rules of debate. Sir, I am speaking by the book of what I know from information on the very highest authority. The leader of the Senate then stated that during the recess he would consult his colleagues, and after recess he came down and put the clause, which is now clause 110, into the hands of Mr. Girard, who moved it, and it was carried in the Senate. If that be so—and we had no clear explanation about it, although I threw out the challenge in my opening remarks—then the responsibility for this trouble rests not upon my shoulders but upon the shoulders of the hon. member for Bothwell and his friends in the Government at that time. Those are the men who are responsible for the trouble, and it became my duty to bring it forward. I do not say I have not failed in my duty heretofore; I failed in my duty probably in not being present when that was done, but I do not suppose that a young member, for I was then only in my second year of my parliamentary life, would have ventured to interpose at that stage of the Session. That I have failed in my duty since I do not pretend to deny, but when I did ascertain the facts I would have been wanting in my duty, feeling and believing as I do feel and believe with respect to this matter, if I had not brought it to the attention of the country in the first place, and, in the second place, to the attention of this House. With respect to other matters on which I desire to speak before I deal with the question itself: It is true I addressed a meeting in Montreal; it is true I addressed a meeting in this city of Ottawa, but those who know the facts must know that those meetings which I have had the honor to address were not of my seeking. I have a list of places and a bundle of papers which would satisfy hon. gentlemen that I, at all events, was not seeking to force myself upon the public, but my attendance was demanded by the great city of Montreal and by the city of Ottawa, and it was only in answer to repeated calls that I went to those different cities. So much with respect to what has been said in regard to this agitation. If hon. gentlemen will deal with the matter fairly, they will see that there was no other course open to me, feeling as I feel, and realising my responsibility as a member of this House, but to take the action I have pursued. But exception has been taken to some of my language. I had the misfortune to miss the speech of the hon. leader of the Opposition, and I have not yet had time, having only received *Hansard* this evening, to peruse his speech throughout; but I am told the hon. gentleman assailed my speech on the ground that I had used harsh expressions with regard to his nationality. If the hon. gentleman understood my remarks were with respect to his nationality and his race, then I do not wonder

at the hon. gentleman's indignation. If the hon. gentleman supposes that I was capable of speaking of any people of this Dominion, or any section of the people of this Dominion, in these terms, he was perfectly within his duty in calling attention to the language and denouncing it in the most vigorous terms. But that was not the meaning of my words and I think my hon. friend, a master as he is of our own tongue, perfectly well realised that was not the meaning. I spoke of the national cry and the national party that he among others has been establishing and fomenting in one of the Provinces of this Dominion, and I denounced that nationality, or rather that pretending nationality as a bastard nationality. I again denounce it here on the floor of Parliament as such. I say that the legitimate nationality, and there is but one, is the nationality common to us all, the nationality that spreads from ocean to ocean and embraces all races and peoples within this great Dominion. I say that if any one in any portion or corner of this Dominion gathers a party together, whether English, Irish, Scotch or French, and endeavors to raise a cry on the nationality of that particular race, there is no word that describes it other than the word that I used, and to which the hon. gentleman called attention. Although the hon. gentleman thought I dare not, I have no hesitation of repeating that statement on the floor of this House, and there is no hon. member understanding the sense in which I stated it before, and in which I repeat it now, who can deny that the expression used was applicable.

Mr. LAURIER. The expression was unfortunate.

Mr. McCARTHY. The hon. gentleman may say so, but I do not know how else he could put it. It is justice to him I will say that he quoted my words fairly, or otherwise I would have quoted them myself. There is but one nationality that I, at all events, am willing to recognise in this country. I do not speak of our loyalty to the Throne; I do not speak of our allegiance to the mother country: I speak of that higher nationality of Canadians to Canada. I speak not of one nationality, not of one race, but of all Canada and all Canadians joined together as we should be joined and proud to acknowledge our allegiance. I regret that so much time has been taken up by a somewhat personal explanation, but, perhaps, if I was to do the subject justice with which I propose to deal, it was necessary that I should clear away from the discussion those extraneous matters which those opposed to me have thought well to introduce. We perfectly well understand the arts of the politician. We do not always spread it so exactly or plainly to the public as the innocent member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright); we do not always exactly announce that we are giving party instructions when we speak on the floor of Parliament as that hon. gentleman has thought fit to do, but it has been perfectly plain and perfectly clear to the vision of the most uninitiated among us that the object here has been not to discuss this matter on its merits, not to deal with this question, as it ought to be dealt with, as to whether it should or not become law, but by abusing the plaintiff's attorney—the unfortunate promoter of the Bill—and by raising clouds of race prejudices and religious prejudices as well, to have this Bill rejected because

of matters which ought not to have been mentioned in connection with it. What is the proposition we are dealing with here? It is a simple one. It is said that it is the entering of the thin end of the wedge; it is said that I have commenced a crusade, and that this is the first thing I have attempted and that my success in this will mean success later on in other matters. Even if that were so, and if the continuance of the present condition of things is an injury to the people of the North-West—if this is calculated to do that great portion of our Dominion an injustice, are the people of the North-West to suffer under this grievance because of the unfortunate language—if it be unfortunate—because of the unfortunate terms—if they be unfortunate—in which the Bill was presented to the House of Commons. I do not think the practical people of this country will accept any such excuse. I will just add as a rider to the advice of the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright): "Do not I beseech you hon. members who sit behind him allow yourselves to be carried away with such ill advice as that." This Bill and this only must be dealt with on its merits. It is not for the speech of the member who introduced it you are going to vote, it is not for his speech in the Opera House at Ottawa you are going to vote, but you must vote "yea" or "nay" upon the Bill itself which is now before you. If that Bill is one which in the interests of our common country should be passed, I do not think that excuses such as are presented here will save hon. gentlemen from the just indignation of their constituents. Again, there has been a very great misrepresentation of what I stated in my speech. My argument upon the question of language is to be found in these words:

"Now I venture to think I have to advance some explanation of the proposition which I am dealing with—that is, that language is of great importance, that it is of vital consequence to the nation, that the language spoken by its people should be common to them all, and that they should not at all events be encouraged and trained in speaking different languages."

Is there anything revolutionary in that? Is this the language of the incendiary? Is there anything here that ought not to have been uttered on the floor of Parliament. You can look throughout the speech and you will find nothing more radical than that. I gave my reasons and I cited what my hon. friend from West Assiniboia (Mr. Davin) was good enough to sneer at as my "authorities." We are not all, like the hon. member for Assiniboia, versed in literature, history, philology, ethnology and in all the other subjects he is so well acquainted with, nor is the country so learned as that hon. gentleman; and I thought in justice to my position that I should quote my authorities. This subject is a comparatively new one to most of us, and I do not repeat of it in the slightest degree that in the introduction of this Bill I stated my reasons and gave my authorities, which have been open to the criticisms of hon. members who did me the honor to listen to my address or who read my observations. After all the impassioned language we have heard, after all the abuse that has been heaped upon my devoted head, I ask: Do not those words of mine stand unrefuted and incapable of refutation? The hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills) and the hon. member for North York (Mr. Mulock)—the loyal embryo knight from that constituency—have first set up a man of straw and then

attacked him. The hon. member for Bothwell contended that I had not gone far enough that I ought to have struck at the language here in this chamber and in the Province of Quebec—that I ought to have prevented its use in the pulpit, on the platform, in the schools, and so on. Why, Sir, we have nothing to do with these matters; we have no call to meddle with them; but I am glad to be able to inform the hon. gentleman that the North-West Legislative Assembly are themselves dealing with this matter of the schools, which is, perhaps, the most important of all. They, discovering as they did lately, just as we have discovered lately, what was going on in the so-called Separate schools in the French settlements, have already, in advance of the Province of Ontario, put an end to that, and the teaching is now in the English tongue. What I have sought for here is that which is in our power. We have this enormous territory yet to be peopled by millions, and do we want to have repeated there the spectacle which is presented on the floor of this House, or the spectacle, still more deplorable from a patriotic point of view, which is depicted in the Legislative Chamber of the Province of Quebec? Do you want that, Sir? It would be better that we all spoke French than that half of us should speak French and half of us English.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. Hear, hear.

Mr. McCARTHY. The hon. gentleman says "hear, hear," and he is quite right. I do not pretend to know the glories of the French language, but I do know enough from what I have been told to believe that it is a beautiful tongue. But that is not the question we are dealing with. We know that the French language is not and never can be the language of British North America and we ought to realize—more especially ought the French Canadians of this country to realize—that their true interest, as our true interest, is at as early a day as possible to have but the one language spoken in this country. Well, of course, I do not expect, and it would be hardly reasonable to expect, that those hon. gentlemen who agree with me that we should all be better speaking French will go the other step with me and agree that we should be all the better speaking English, though the hon. leader of the Opposition I am told—for I had not the honor of hearing him—rather leaned to that view. Now, I am not going to follow the hon. gentlemen on the other side of the House in their excursions into Switzerland, Austria, Hungary, Cape Colony, Mauritius, and other places which have been brought to our notice. I have stated before, and I repeat, that these cases are not the rule, but the exception; and while I quite admit that the Province of Quebec is also an exceptional case, the legislation proposed here has no reference to that Province; it has no reference even to this Parliament: it is with regard to the great territories of the North-West, which have always belonged to the Crown of England, which never belonged to the French in any sense, notwithstanding the statement of the bishop which is in our Votes and Proceedings. History tells us that north of the Height of Land and from there to the Pacific Ocean the Frenchman, although he went there, went there as a trespasser, and was expelled as a trespasser. I see a smile on the face of the philosopher from Bothwell, who endeavored to prove that

the French territory extended as far as the Rocky Mountains.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). So it did.

Mr. McCARTHY. But that was settled by the boundary decision. Those who represented the Province of Ontario in that dispute, before the Privy Council, put forward that pretension, and the hon. gentleman sat there with his wig on his head ready to argue, if he were only allowed, in favor of it, but it was better argued by his seniors. But the Privy Council rejected his contention, and the boundary was placed where we now have it.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). Not at all; it was on the ground of acquiescence that they decided.

Mr. McCARTHY. The hon. gentleman is, of course, wiser than the rest of us. As the Privy Council gave no reason for their judgment, but simply reported to Her Majesty where the boundary was, I do not know where he got that information.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). During the argument.

Mr. McCARTHY. There was not one word during the argument, which I took part in, which would lead to that conclusion. At all events, the observation of a judge during an argument is not a decision.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). The observation of Lord Selborne.

Mr. McCARTHY. If the hon. gentleman will keep his soul in patience we shall get on more easily with this debate. That being so, on what pretense, I want to know, did that hon. gentleman's Government introduce this clause into the North West Territories Act? I am not now discussing the Province of Manitoba; but with regard to the North West Territories, is there a shadow of reason for this provision? If so, it has not yet been given to show why the dual language should be imposed on the people of the North-West Territories. If there be no answer, as no answer there can be, then I want to know what is the duty of this Parliament? Is the duty of this Parliament to leave it there? In that respect I understand that the politician of the party, the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) differs from the hon. member for West Durham, and he is wise to differ with him and withdraw himself from his protection. The proposition of the hon. member for West Durham, the most monstrous ever submitted to any assembly, is to keep the language as an encouragement to the French to emigrate to the North West, and to settle this question, by-and-by, after they get there. If they go in masses, says the hon. member, I shall much regret it; but if they do go there in masses, and we perfectly well know that they do not go in any other way, then, he said, something will have to be done. If I might appeal to the reason of the House without prejudice, I would say, let us look at the position of the North-West to-day. We are told, and the census confirms it, that in 1885 there were but 1,500 French Canadians in the North-West. If you add the number of the half-breeds of French descent, the number will still be less than 5,000. I have got the exact figures here. We know that at the time to which I refer, there were in the three districts 23,285 English-speaking people; I am leaving the Indians out of consideration. The ratio is

therefore 83 to 17 per cent., and if our records are correct that disproportion has been vastly increased, and it is not too much to say that there are not to-day in the North West one tenth of the people who speak the French language to the nine-tenths who speak the English language. And moreover, when we look at the record we find that these French are scattered.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). Then they are not in the mass?

Mr. McCARTHY. "Then they are not in the mass" is the very erudite observation made by the hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills). They are here, there and everywhere, in small bands and surrounded by a large population of English-speaking people. That being so, can there be any better time for settling this question than the present? Should there be an immigration in the North West, in the near future, of the French Canadians, should they go in there induced by the speech of the hon. member for West Durham (Mr. Blake), or should this House be insane enough to adopt the proposed resolution of that hon. gentleman, I do not know, in common justice, how it would be possible to say, by-and-by, to those who had immigrated upon the faith of such resolution, that this dual language should be done away with. Therefore, this is the time to deal with the question, and I venture to say that this is the place. The hon. member for South Oxford threw another insinuation, and it certainly would be more satisfactory, if instead of insinuating, he would make his statements so clear that they could be understood. He said that the North-West Council had been moved to present the petition I spoke of by some outside influence, about which he indicated I knew something. What did the hon. gentleman mean? Has the hon. gentleman ever been in the North-West? Has he ever seen the members of the Council or of the Assembly? Does he know the character of the men there? My whole connection with the North-West Assembly commenced with stopping over at Calgary and then passing on; and I had only one communication with one of the members of that Council after this matter was dealt with by the Council, and that was with reference to the form in which the petition ought to be presented to this House. But to suppose that the North-West Council, composed of 22 members, representing three districts, which are in a much less degree represented in this House, were not competent to deal with this question; to suppose that their opinion is to have no weight with us, but it is to be set at naught; to suppose that the great doctrine of provincial rights in the case of the North-West Council is not to have even the support of hon. gentlemen opposite, is a very extraordinary conclusion to arrive at. Now, what is the position? The North-West Council, by a petition which is practically unanimous—carried by 20 to 2, and which has been laid on the Table, asks for the passage of a measure such as the one I have introduced. Hearing that petitions were being presented here from certain settlements, there was at once—and without the slightest communication, so far as I know, with any member of this House; without any communication at all events with me—a burst of indignation at what appeared to these men to be the imposition which was being practised upon this House. The petitions which the

hon. members presented, and which aroused this indignation, were couched as follows :

"The petition of the undersigned humbly expose that at a public meeting of the ratepayers of Lethbridge, District of Alberta, N. W. T., held this second day of January, A. D. 1890, they have been respectively appointed chairman and secretary, and that the following resolution has been unanimously adopted :

"Whereas, the French language is, under the constitution and the laws, one of the two official languages of the Dominion; and

"Whereas, under the 'North-West Territories Act' the French is, equally with the English, an official language, the suppression of its use, as such, in the North-West Territories, would be a flagrant injustice towards the settlers of French origin, who were the pioneers of this country, and towards those of the same race, who, upon the faith of the constitution and existing laws, came and established themselves in the North-West, and have contributed, with other citizens, of other nationalities, to the development of the resources of the country ;

"Be it resolved :

"That a petition containing the resolution that has just been passed be signed by the chairman and the secretary of this meeting, and be addressed to the House of Commons, asking that no law be passed affecting the rights of the population with regard to the official use of the French language, as guaranteed by the constitution and the 'North-West Territories Act.'

No sooner did the news reach the North-West than petitions such as this were being circulated ; than an indignation meeting was called at Lethbridge. What was the result of that meeting ? I have a telegram which was sent to me, and which reads as follows :

"At a meeting of the Board of Trade of Lethbridge, thirty-five members present, the following resolution was passed :—

"Moved by J. D. Higginbotham, seconded by C. C. McCaul, that whereas it appears from reports in the public press that a petition purporting to be from the ratepayers of Lethbridge, against the proposal to abolish the dual language system, has been presented to Parliament, this Board of Trade emphatically protest against such petition being accepted as the views of the ratepayers or inhabitants of Lethbridge, because no such public meeting was ever held in Lethbridge, and the said petition was secretly prepared and forwarded, and the ratepayers of Lethbridge never had any opportunity of voting thereon, and that a copy of this resolution be telegraphed to Mr. Dalton McCarthy, and a copy forwarded by mail to the public press. Please let D. W. Davis, M.P., have copy of this telegram.

"W. A. GALLIHER,  
*Secretary Board of Trade.*"

Mr. CHAPLEAU. And the Privy Council has a communication which shows what the meeting was and the number of people present, and which exposes the falsity of that telegram.

Mr. McCARTHY. I am very sorry the hon. gentleman did not think fit to lay it upon the Table.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. It is before the Privy Council, and the names can't be given and the papers produced at any time my hon. friend wants them.

Mr. McCARTHY. I do not think any statement of that kind would convince me, and I will tell the hon. gentleman the reason why. I have a letter from a gentleman, who has given me the liberty to read it—a gentleman well known to the right hon. the First Minister, and who is as incapable of telling an untruth as is the hon. the Provincial Secretary himself.

"February 5th, 1890.

"DEAR MR. McCARTHY.—The *Empire* publishes certain resolutions in regard to the dual language question, purporting to have been passed at a public meeting of rate-

payers at Lethbridge. The 'public meeting' must have been very privately called, as none of the ratepayers to the public school ever heard of it. It was in fact a meeting of the Roman Catholic supporters of the separate school, a very small minority—and they were very careful not to let the general public get any inkling of their proceedings.

"You can rely on it that the general feeling of Lethbridge and this district, is entirely in favor of your motion.

"Yours faithfully,

"C. C. McCaul.

"You are at liberty to make any use of this letter that you see fit."

That is not the only communication I got. I got a letter from Banff from a gentleman perfectly well known to the right hon. the First Minister, Mr. Frederick J. Boswell :

"MY DEAR McCARTHY.—I noticed in the Toronto *Globe* the announcement that Davis, M. P. for Alberta, has presented to the House of Commons from Banff, Anthracite, Canmore, &c., a resolution asking the Parliament not to do away with the French language in the Territories ; that the said resolutions were passed at public meetings held in the above named places ; I can most positively assure you that no such meetings were held either at Banff, Anthracite or Canmore, the only meetings that have been held were two, in reference to the regulations and leases in the townsite of Banff.

"I think it right to let you know this, as I am with you in re your dual language Bill and am at work getting a petition signed by all inhabitants of this place backing you up. Dr. Brett, our member of the Legislative Assembly, is strongly in your favor, and you may depend that if it is referred to the Assembly he will do his utmost to carry it.

"I think it very unjust of Davis to misrepresent us.

"Wishing you and your Bill every success.

"I remain,  
"Yours very sincerely,  
"FRED J. BOSWELL."

I have also a telegram, which I believe was also sent to the hon. member who represents Alberta in this House (Mr. Davis), in these words :

"At a mass meeting in Calgary to-night, Mayor Lafferty, chairman, the following resolutions passed by 290 to 7 :—

"No. 1. That the use of a dual language in official proceedings in the North-West Territories is unnecessary, expensive and calculated to prevent the complete union of the several nationalities who reside in the Territories, and that to bring about a united Canadian people in this part of the Dominion, the English language alone should be legalised in the proceedings of the Legislative Assembly, the courts, and all other official bodies.

"No. 2. That this meeting heartily endorses the action of the Legislative Assembly at Regina, in reference to the dual language, and requests that the petition presented to the Dominion Government in pursuance of such action be granted.

"No. 3. That a copy of the above resolutions be forwarded to D. W. Davis, M.P., D'Alton McCarthy, M.P., the Hon. James Lougheed, and the Dominion Parliament, and that D. W. Davis, M.P., be requested to forward in every way the movement for the abolition of French as an official language in the Territories."

Now, let us see where we stand in regard to this question, considered as a local one. The members of the North-West Council were elected two years ago, if my memory serves me, since the members of this House who sit for that district were elected. They are twenty-two in number. They are spread, of course, and come much more in contact with the people of their respective territories than do the members who sit here, whose districts are so much larger. They have unanimously, or with practical unanimity, petitioned this House to abolish this clause in the North-West Territories Act. On the motion being made here, and the matter being brought before Parliament, and it appearing that certain cut-and-dried petitions were presented here from certain places in that Territory, the people there at once set about getting up

counter petitions which I have had the honor to present to the House. They are not petitions ~~put~~ porting to be signed by the chairmen and secretaries of public meetings, which may conceal the fact that no such meetings were held, but they are signed by the leading men in the places from which they come. For instance, in Calgary, the petition was signed by the mayor at the head, by two ex-mayors and over 500 others; and, in another place, the petition is signed by a French Catholic gentleman, who, I think must be the gentleman who grows coffee, to whom the member for West Assiniboia (Mr. Davin) referred to the other night, though of that I am not quite sure. Then we have a public meeting at which a vote of 250 to 7 was recorded in favor of this change, and yet we are told that we do not know what the feelings of the people of the North-West are in regard to this question, and that we ought to give them time for consideration, and to allow the members of the Assembly there another opportunity of appealing to their constituents.

There are many other questions which come before this House with which, if that argument is to prevail, we would find it difficult to deal at all. But I do not conceal the fact that I do not look upon this matter as a local question. When I addressed

the people of Calgary, and they were good enough to say that they understood I was to take a part in the movement to abolish the separate school system and the dual language in the North-West, I said, as to the dual language I shall move in Parliament, whether you petition or not. I look upon that question as a matter of national importance, as a matter affecting the whole Dominion, as a matter which is proper to be dealt with in Parliament and not by a Local Legislature. I found at the same time, in the organ of the hon. gentleman which is published in the city of Toronto, a statement that if the people in the North-West signified their desire to abolish the use of that language officially, effect would be given to their wish. When the Assembly met, almost their earliest act, and I think not their least important act, was to adopt this petition, which placed on two grounds their desire to abolish the use of that language: one, that it was not required in the interest of the country; and the other, that it was contrary to sound public policy that two languages should prevail. Follow that up by the petitions I have had the honor to present, and by the report which I have read from my place in Parliament, and then, if the House is not seized of the opinions of the North-West in regard to this matter, I fail to see how we will ever be able to obtain the views of that people on the subject. Do not let us exaggerate, I have no desire at all to exaggerate the importance of this question of language. I admit as freely as it can be admitted that there are cases, and the case of Switzerland is one, where, under peculiar circumstances, people speaking different languages, those languages being officially three instead of two, have enjoyed a certain amount of prosperity, or very great prosperity if you like. But do hon. gentlemen see any analogy between Switzerland and Canada? The cantons of Switzerland came together as independent bodies under bargains and terms and conditions to which everyone of them had to agree, and that possesses nothing of an analogy to the case of our own North-West. But, if we look at the history of the Swiss Con-

federation, what do we find? I hardly expected from the historian of the House, the hon. member for West Assiniboia (Mr. Davin), that so much stress would be laid upon the case of Switzerland. Let us look at this case of Switzerland for a few moments, while I give a short statement of its history. It is quite true that Switzerland is composed of 22 cantons, it is quite true that there are three official languages there, it is equally true that there is a fourth language which is not recognised. But the history of the Swiss constitution may briefly be summarised thus: Between 1291 and 1874, the confederation has passed through no less than seven phases, of which, since 1798, there have been four — one in 1798, one in 1803, another in 1815, another 1848, and a revision in 1874. Is that the evidence of a stable constitution? Is that the kind of constitution that the hon. member would like to have fastened upon the people of his beloved North-West? Just let us see:

"The third phase lasted till 1798" —

I am reading from the best work, I believe, on the subject, the work of Sir F. O. Adams:

"without modification, and was marked by internal discord, religious wars, and revolts of peasants."

That is the first beautiful picture we have of the Confederation of Switzerland. This phase lasted from 1815 to 1848:

"Then came an epoch of agitation and of discord.

"The Confederation suffered from a fundamental vice, i.e., the powerlessness of the central authority. The Cantons had become too independent, and gave to their deputies instructions differing widely from each other."

Now, here is what we find happening in 1847:

"On the 4th November, 1847, after the deputies of the Sonderbond had left the Diet, this league was declared to be dissolved, and hostilities broke out between the two contending parties. A short and decisive campaign of twenty-five days ensued: Freiburg was taken by the Federal troops under General Dufour, later Luzern opened its gates, the small cantons and the Valais capitulated, and the strife came to an end."

Now, let me give you a comment upon this from a paper which, perhaps, will not command the attention of the members of this House, the Edinburgh *Review*, which, so late, as the month of January last, spoke of the Swiss Executive in these words:

"It (the Swiss Executive) guides the policy of a state eternally menaced by foreign complications; it preserves harmony throughout a confederacy made up of twenty-two cantons, each jealous of one another and sympathising only in common jealousy of the Federal power."

I do not think that any of us would like to plant in the virgin soil of the North-West, a constitution such as the Swiss constitution, with the results which have attended its use, and, therefore, the illustration is very far fetched. Take another illustration which we have had, take Cape Colony; I dare say some hon. gentleman know more about Cape Colony than I do, possibly some members of this House may have visited it; but is it not a fact that the Dutch Boers, as they are called, have rebelled and have left the English colony and have formed an independent republic on its borders? Have not, within recent times, the British arms suffered a defeat at their hands, and to-day is there not very great trouble between the Dutch who remain in the English colony? Certainly, it is the last example I would expect to be given by any persons, cognisant with the facts in support of a duality of language in any country. But need we

go so far afield? Let me give one more instance, wearisome as these instances may be. I cannot forbear quoting to the House the striking example of Bohemia. Bohemia, we all know, is inhabited by two nationalities, the Germans, and the Zechs, speaking each their language. We know an attempt was made, not long ago, to put down one of these languages, and how has a settlement been arrived at? What has been the only possible solution? Under the influence of the Emperor Francis Joseph, who is beloved by his subjects, and who has great influence among them, they have resolved to settle the difficulty in this extraordinary fashion: the Diet is informally divided into two Curia, one German and the other Zech, which sit and debate together, although each possesses the full power of a separate and co-ordinate House. That is the only solution for a duality of language which could be found in Bohemia, and it was found necessary to resort to that in order to prevent these people from flying at one another's throats, it was found necessary to resort to that to prevent the Germans from deserting to Bismark. Now, what is the position here? because, it is useless for us to go further than our own country. If this language is not designedly perpetuated with the view of keeping up the French nationality which the hon. leader of the Opposition has been the only French Canadian on the floor of Parliament to denounce, or to say that he does not sympathise with it.

Mr. LAURIER. What?

Mr. McCARTHY. A French nationality.

Mr. LAURIER. What did you say?

Mr. McCARTHY. I say you denounced it; I say that the leader of the Opposition is the only gentleman of that nationality who denounced it.

Mr. LAURIER. Dénouee what, my nationality?

Mr. McCARTHY. No, not your nationality: but the formation of a French nation upon this continent.

Mr. LAURIER. No.

Mr. McCARTHY. I ask, what is the ultimate result of the system that is being pursued in regard to the French language throughout this Dominion? Is there any other result, except the one which is pointed out to us in newspapers in the Province of Quebec? Is that not the logical outcome of the views which were enunciated so freely by *La Vérité* which I read to this House when I had the honor to introduce this Bill? I know no other. But I deny the right of any gentleman in this House to repudiate the language of the mountebank, as the hon. member for West Assiniboia (Mr. Davin) calls him, the "mountebank Premier" of the Province of Quebec. The language is not mine. I differ from Mr. Mercier as much as it is possible to differ from any public man, but yet I have too great a respect for my French Canadian fellow-subjects to speak of their First Minister in the language which was used by the champion of their cause on the floor of this Parliament: for I recognise in him, whatever his other faults may be, one of the greatest men which his nationality has produced in Canada. We know that although it may suit the purposes of the leader of the Opposition to say that he does not sympathise with these aspirations, his words are not uttered in the Province of Quebec. We know that the hon. gentle-

man is going hand in hand with the Premier of the Province of Quebec in all his local contests, in all his endeavors to fasten what he calls the Nationalist Party upon that Province, and in which, up to this time, he has been successful. We know, Sir, that the hon. gentleman was present at a great public meeting at which the Premier of Quebec announced the aspirations of the French Canadian people to be the formation of a great French nationality, not under the glorious Union Jack, of which we hear so much in this House from some hon. gentlemen who do not say so much about it in the Province of Quebec, but under the Tricolor, and he advised the members of both parties to join under the Tricolor of France, the flag of France, not that they wished to unite with France; I quite agree that that is not their aspiration; the Republic of France does not suit the French Canadians of that view in the Province of Quebec; but that they did announce that their nationality was typified by the French flag, the Tricolor of France. That language was uttered at a great meeting of their fellow-countrymen, that that language was uttered by the Premier of Quebec in the presence of the leader of the Opposition in this House, without demur, without contradiction, without remonstrance, and without reproach, goes without saying.

Mr. LAURIER. Would the hon. gentleman permit me to interrupt him? On the occasion to which he alludes I spoke after Mr. Mercier, and I spoke afterwards in Toronto, quoting word for word the language I had used in Quebec.

Mr. McCARTHY. The hon. gentleman is perfectly right, and yet my statement remains uncontradicted. The hon. gentleman did speak in honeyed words, first of his love for his own nationality, and secondly of his love for the other nationalities of the Dominion. What I am complaining of is this: if that was not the view of the hon. gentleman, then and there, before the thousands who were assembled, before the great body of his fellow-countrymen, was the time for prompt repudiation and not here. But no repudiation came. Is it possible under these conditions for us to stand still? Have we no other evidence of the aspirations of the hon. gentleman's party, because he is reaping the benefit of that party, that party which is his strength in the Province of Quebec? It is only a few days ago, certainly only a few weeks ago, since the hon. gentleman wrote an open letter calling upon his people, notwithstanding the rebellion of the old Liberal Party of which he was at one time a member, when they rebelled against this new proposed national cry of the Premier of the Province of Quebec; the hon. gentleman instead of joining with his own frères, wrote to the constituency or a prominent member in it, urging their support to the new party formed by the Premier of Quebec.

Mr. LAURIER. Against the Tories.

Mr. McCARTHY. He had been a Tory or a Bleu, and he became a convert to the Nationalist cry and went over to the Nationalist Party against the remonstrances of the old Liberal Party of the Province. The hon. gentleman thought fit to interpose and interfere. Is that all? When the hon. gentleman joined in the agitation with respect to Riel, I wonder did he ever think that he

would be denouncing a member of this House for incendiarism? I wonder did he ever think he would be denouncing a brother member for raising a cry and appealing to the passions of the people? Does the hon. gentleman remember his course upon that occasion?" Sir, does he remember that when Riel, after a fair trial, after being ably defended and impartially tried, was justly executed?

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh, Oh.

Mr. McCARTHY. Justly executed yes. At a meeting in Montreal, led by the lieutenant of the hon. member for West Durham (Mr. Blake) who sits here for western Ontario, influenced by purely patriotic considerations for the good of the country, this extraordinary language was used by the present leader of the Opposition at that excited time, when a statesman would have naturally used a language tending to quiet and subdue the disturbed passions of the multitude. And what were the words?

"He (Laurier) had been on the banks of the Saskatchewan when the rebellion broke out; he would have taken up arms against the Government."

He further said:

"It must be well understood by all that this was not a war of races, but rather a vindication of the rights of one race that claimed for the French that which is granted to all other nationalities. The crime of Regina would still be avenged, not only by the French, but by all other races. They were asking for no favor, but they only wanted common justice pure and simple. They were as jealous of the liberties of others as of their own; and if injustice was done one class, injustice might be done to others."

He further said:

"They cannot bring Riel back to life, but by patriotically uniting together they can drive from power the wretches who had so pitilessly put him to death." • • • "Sir John had not had the courage of dealing leniently with a man who represented a cause which he had not treated fairly and justly."

"This was a free country and not even the Government had the right of committing judicial murder."

This was the language of the hon. gentleman, who has had the hardihood to speak of my moderate terms as being calculated to arouse angry passions, race difficulties and troubles. Does the hon. gentleman repent of those words? No. His benches are filled by his fellow-countrymen by reason of those words, and although some of them sit there to day not following or supporting him, it is simply by reason of the accident that he did not secure a majority. The hon. gentleman profits by that language, and he has no reason to regret it. We recognize that by means of this cry the then Government of the Province of Quebec, the best Government the Province has had since Confederation was ejected from office. Why? Because they declined to vote censure upon the Administration at Ottawa. Mr. Mercier, taking advantage of the excited feeling of the Province, gathered together the Nationalist Party, nationalist in the narrow sense to which I have referred, and, joining hands with the hon. gentleman here, brought about a result which deprived this House of many supporters from the French portion for hon. gentlemen on this side of the House, and brought strength to hon. gentlemen opposite. People might not consider the words of politicians of such serious moment, but we cannot disregard what we see going on before our eyes. The other day a young lady, Miss Maybee, was sent down to the Post Office Department in Quebec. She had the misfor-

tune to speak English and to come from Ontario; and will it be believed, and yet we know it perfectly well to be the case, that those supporting the hon. gentleman opposite at once denounced the Government and the Postmaster General for making the appointment.

Mr. LAURIER. And the Ministerial papers, too.

Mr. McCARTHY. I am astounded at it. I did not think that matters had gone to that length; I have not seen the references, and I will be delighted if the hon. gentleman will furnish them to me. So it now happens, if the hon. gentleman's statement is correct, and he would not make a statement if it was not correct, that both French parties in Quebec object to an English speaking lady.

Some hon. MEMBERS. No, no.

Mr. McCARTHY. The hon. gentleman admits it. I repeat that they object to an English lady being sent down there. I have the words in some of the newspapers if the hon. gentleman wishes them. The howl was raised, and it was successful. I am sorry to say. I am sorry to know that the old politeness of the French race seems to have departed, for I thought a young lady would have been favorably received; but objection was made by *L'Électeur* and another paper. Here are the words:

"*L'Électeur* joins us in protesting against the nomination of Miss Maybee to the Post Office Inspector's Office. The rumor going round, according to what *L'Électeur* says, is that we are going to give employment in the Civil Service at Quebec to a lady of Ontario. As the occupation of this lady would simply be to run a typewriter in the post office, we don't see why we should go so far to get a typewriter that we could find so easily at home."

"It is not in our knowledge, and it is not in the knowledge of any person, that they would think for a moment of bringing a French Canadian girl from Quebec or Ontario to occupy a position of any kind of employment in Ontario. Are we supposed to be more generous, more agreeable, than our neighbors, especially when we have persons who are qualified to do the work in question?"

I can assure the hon. gentleman that if a young lady is sent to Ontario or Toronto she will not be denounced in the public press, but she will be received with kindness, courtesy and consideration. Another article follows, which I need not trouble the House by reading. That is another result of these race troubles and race difficulties. But it is not the most serious in my humble judgment that we have to deal with. I find in a French publication of recent date, M. Tardivel, under the heading "Anglicism—Behold the Enemy," writes:

"Reflecting a little upon the situation I saw a great danger for the future of the French Canadian race. Language is the soul of a nation. If the Basques have been able so long to preserve intact their ancient institutions amidst the revolutions and the wars which have convulsed France and Spain; if the Bretons and the Welsh have remained distinct from the races which surround them, they have their language to thank for it. If Ireland struggles in vain to regain her independence, it is because she no longer speaks the language of her old kings. Do you wish to cause a people to disappear? Destroy its language. It is because they comprehend this truth that Russia shows herself so inexorable towards the Polish language, and that Germany seeks to proscribe the French language of Alsace-Lorraine. It is then important for a people, especially a conquered people, to preserve its language."

The same writer again says:

"I stop here. I make no claim to have exhausted the subject, far from it. I have simply desired to utter this note of alarm: 'Fight the anglicization of the French language,' and at the same time to give some proofs that

this enemy is really to be feared. Let others with more authority than I possess continue the combat; and if one day those who love the French language decide to make a grand assault, all along the line, be assured that I shall not fail to respond to the appeal.

Mr. LAURIER. What paper is that from?

Mr. McCARTHY. It is not a paper at all.

Mr. GIROUARD. Surely we are entitled to know what the hon. gentleman is reading from.

Mr. FISSET. May I ask the hon. gentleman from what journal he is reading? I do not understand that he has told us from what paper he is quoting.

Mr. McCARTHY. It is a pamphlet by Tardivel. Then another writer, Mr. Manseau, in a book published in 1881, writes:

"The dictionary gives the technical definition of *Anglicism*. Here follows, in our opinion, a definition from the heart. It is a spot of blood that shows us through what place the claws of the British lion have passed, and these claws (who is there that knows it not) torture and flag our language until they kill it."

I will not trouble the House with more extracts of this description, but I will draw the attention of my hon. friends on both sides to the instruction given in the French schools, and if there is then an hon. member who thinks that children so taught or instructed with regard to this history of our country can grow up as British citizens, or British subjects, or as loyal except to their own French Canadian nationality, or that anything can be expected from them except the language of *La Vérité* and the language of the Premier of the Province of Quebec; then I think that hon. gentlemen will be incapable of reasoning. In this history I find the following:

"1774. England, fearful of losing Canada, in view of the menacing attitude of the United States, made haste to grant a new constitution more favorable to the Catholics."

Mr. AMYOT. Hear, hear.

Mr. McCARTHY. The hon. gentleman says "Hear, hear." There is not a shadow of doubt that this is the teachings in the schools. Every concession that has been obtained is always pictured to the people of the Province of Quebec as having been wrung from tyrants and despots and not granted by the free-will of the people.

Mr. AMYOT. You are a tyrant to us.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order.

Mr. McCARTHY. I quote also another selection from one of these histories:

"The material forces of New France had to succumb in the end, but the providential forces still do their work in the colony, which is probably destined to play on this continent the part which old France has played on the Continent of Europe."

I think I have read of similar language in *La Vérité*. If this is the teaching of the schools, if these are the writings of the different writers, if this is the language of the Premier of the Province, if these are the utterances at the great public meetings held in that Province (and no man is bold enough to assert a single word of dissent to them) what possible outcome can there be except the natural outcome which is here announced on the floor of Parliament. If my ears did not deceive me I think I heard the Minister of Public Works speak of the autonomy of his race, and state that his nation would live in spite of all that might be done against it. We must

remember that this has been a British colony for over a century and a quarter, and that within a very short period after the cession I was nearly using the unfortunate word conquest a distinguished French traveller passing through here was able to announce that the French Canadians were better treated under the English than they were under their own Kings. We must remember that from that time to this they have enjoyed a liberty which they could not possibly have enjoyed under the Crown of France yet; notwithstanding this, they are endeavoring to perpetuate this race and nation by mainly by their language, which is the soul of the nation, as this writer says. If the language was permitted to die out, as it would naturally do, all this ambition, which must end in delusion, which can never end in anything but delusion and which can never lead to any accomplished fact, would soon disappear. We have no jealousy of the Germans, we have no jealousy of any other nationality, because we know that while they speak in their own tongue, and for years after they come here are not able to speak any other tongue, yet they do not propose to divide the people of this country by their race cries and race feelings. Now these are the problems we have to deal with. There is no use our going to Switzerland or to Austro-Hungary for examples. We have to deal with the question we have here at home; and the practical question is, whether, under these circumstances, we shguld permit this kind of thing to go on. Whatever I might do bye-and-by, no man is responsible for my acts. The gentlemen who vote with me now, and the gentlemen who disagree with me, are not responsible for what I may do bye-and-by. I may state—as these hon. gentlemen who have done me the honor of following my utterances with so much care know well—that I have never pretended to believe or to say that it was possible to deal with the dual language in the Province of Quebec. I realise that that is beyond the hope of being dealt with by any possible legislation. I realise that that has been allowed to grow into such monstrous proportions that we can never hope to cope with it, except by natural ways and by natural causes which possibly may work a cure. Not in our day, but within perhaps a time that one can imagine, it may work out its own cure. I look forward to the assimilation that is going on by reason of the travelling backwards and forwards between the French Canadians of Quebec and the Eastern States of the Union. Do what you will, the people do go and will go to the Eastern States. Do what you will, they will more or less imbibe the language of that great country and disseminate it amongst those whom they have left behind. From this side we are taking care that the Province of Ontario will maintain its character as an English speaking Province. This process is going on, I have great hope, and it is a hope which does no injustice to my French Canadian fellow citizens, that bye-and-by the difficulty even in the Province of Quebec may vanish. So that I have never had the ambition, I have never dreamed of interfering. I do not say, Sir, that the time may not come when it will be proper to move—though in that I do not find much sympathy in this House—to do away with the dual language in this Chamber. The time has not come yet, that is quite certain. What we are dealing with now is this question in the North-West, and do not let us mix

up questions that have nothing at all to do with it. One hon. gentleman said I had introduced even a religious cry. "Why, Sir, is freedom of speech so gone in this country that I cannot express my dissent from the system of separate schools which exists in my own Province without being told that I am raising a religious cry?" Is that a question of religion? Is not that a question of great state policy as to how our children shall be educated? And I do hope that before very long the delegation from the Province of Ontario will call on this House for its to blot out the Separate School clause from the British North America Act, which limits and fetters the people of that Province. That clause was carried by a majority of French Canadians, and was imposed upon the people of Ontario against their will; and I am sorry to differ from my hon. leader on that question. He tells us, and I never feel more humiliated than when I hear him speak on that subject—that he participated in imposing that Separate School system upon us. But is it possible that the free people of Ontario are not to be placed in the same position as the people by the sea on both sides of them, in the Maritime Provinces and in British Columbia? If they could not ask this Parliament to aid in freeing them from the restrictions imposed upon them I would despair of the freedom of this country. But that has nothing to do with this question. All these are aside from it, and will be properly dealt with when they come up and not before. What we are dealing with now is the question whether this Bill for the repeal of the dual language in the North-West should or should not become law; that and that only is the question before us. I am sorry, Sir, that the hon. member for West Durham (Mr. Blake) has been compelled by the unfortunate event to which he alluded to absent himself from this discussion. It is not pleasant to speak of an hon. gentleman behind his back, for I cannot quite accept the theory put forward by the hon. member for East Simcoe (Mr. Cook), that that gives one a better privilege to abuse a man; but, perhaps, I may be allowed to say a few words about that hon. gentleman's proposition. You will remember, Sir, that he read us a lecture; he told us how we were not to disturb the harmony that at present existed; how we were to be careful of raising race cries; how he recognised that there was a mass of ignorance, prejudice and bigotry which only required the hand of an incendiary to inflame it, and he rather intimated that the hand of the incendiary had already been laid to that mass; and then he wound up with a fervent appeal that we should never interfere with the covenant, as he called it, made at the time of Confederation. I felt that if that hon. gentleman had not already surrendered to French influences of the Province of Quebec he made his capitulation the other night. But his most extraordinary statement was that we were not informed of the opinion of the people of the North-West, that their representatives had no mandate from them to take up and deal with this question. Did that hon. gentleman remember that when in the Province of Ontario he agitated the country from end to end with regard to the murder of poor Thomas Scott, he sat in the Legislature of Ontario, where he had no mandate to deal with that question? Did the hon. gentleman remember that on one occasion he himself brought into this House a resolution which was offensive to a great many of us

with regard to the Irish question, in order that he might secure the Irish section of our population and draw them to his standard, although he had no mandate, and although this House had no authority to speak with regard to Imperial concerns? Did that hon. gentleman remember that on another occasion he voted for, if he did not move, a resolution on the subject of the dis-establishment of the Irish Church? And yet he undertook to assert that the Legislature of the North-West had no right to petition this Parliament. We had a right to pass offensive resolutions and send them home to England, notwithstanding the rebuff we met with from the Imperial authorities; but the hon. gentleman ventured to assert that the representatives of the North-West had no right to petition or to express their wishes that this clause should be stricken out of the North-West Territories Act. I will say no more in the absence of that hon. gentleman. I now desire, before closing, to say a word or two on the merits of the various motions before the Chair. The amendment of the hon. member for Berthier (Mr. Beausoleil) has received but little favor from any of the English-speaking members. It is one, I think, impossible of acceptance. It announces that if we repeal a clause in the North-West Act, put in under the extraordinary circumstances to which reference has been made, and allowed to remain because attention has not been drawn to it, we shall be shaking the stability of our institutions and destroying the peace and progress of the North-West. The mere recital of that resolution carries its condemnation with it. The other amendment with which we have to deal, and which seems to find a good deal of favor, is the amendment of my hon. friend the member for West Assiniboia (Mr. Davin); and before I deal with that I have somewhat of an apology to make to that hon. gentleman and to this House. I am accused of interfering with the prerogatives of the members from the North-West. Surely, said the hon. Minister of Public Works, echoed by the hon. Secretary of State, there were members in this House representing the North-West whose duty it was to bring this question to the attention of this chamber, and there was rather an insinuation thrown out by the hon. member for Assiniboia himself in his very opening words that my action was an intrusion on his domain; and, if you will pardon me saying so, the bitterness—but that is too strong a word, for he could not be bitter if he tried, but the appearance of bitterness—which characterised his observation I thought had its origin somewhat in pique, that anyone except that hon. gentleman himself should venture to deal with questions affecting the people of the North-West. He and he alone is the guardian of their interests, the only member who has a right to speak on their behalf, and any one else who attempts to do so must expect to meet with the castigation administered to me in the opening of this debate.

Mr. DAVIN. I said you had a right.

Mr. McCARTHY. Yes; but the very observation rather suggested an apology from me. This is my excuse, and the only excuse I give—I am reading from the *Qu'Appelle Progress* of 7th February inst.:—

" Dalton McCarthy introduced into the Dominion Parliament his Bill to abolish the official use of the French language in the North-West. He delivered a very temperate and dispassionate speech, full of facts and arguments."

That is not the way my feeble efforts were characterised in this House; but that seems to be the opinion of the outside world, at all events.

" The second reading is to take place on Wednesday next, when it is expected there will be a big fight. We are informed on good authority that all the North-West representatives will vote against it. If they do so, their constituents should call upon them to resign forthwith. We are also informed that Mr. N. F. Davin will speak against it. West Assiniboia is about the best mis-represented constituency in the North-West. This country is almost unanimous in favor of Mr. McCarthy's Bill, but its representatives all belong to the party machine and must represent the machine in preference to the country."

That, Mr. Speaker, is my apology for venturing to introduce this point to the notice of the House. Now, with regard to the amendment of that hon. gentleman: what is it? My motion is that the Bill be read the second time. Great fault is found with the preamble. The preamble is worse than the enacting clause; the enacting clause is harmless and the preamble is something fearful. Well, to the laymen of the House, perhaps, explanations are necessary about the preamble. To the lawyers of the House an explanation is not called for. It is quite certain, as every lawyer in this House knows, that the preamble neither adds to nor takes from the effect of the enacting clause. The preamble, in this case, I quite admit, was unnecessary. While I do not at all withdraw from the sentiment contained in that preamble, yet as an effective piece of legislation I am free to admit the Bill would be perfectly as good without as with the preamble. Now, if the hon. gentlemen in this House are sincere, and I am bound to believe in their sincerity; if they desire that this dual clause should be expunged or repealed—the hon. member for West Durham thought "expunge" was a very improper word to use; one has to be very careful of his language and must not use words, no matter how plain they may be, except with the greatest care—well, I will call it repeat, or anything you will. But, I say, if hon. gentlemen are sincere in their desire to repeal this clause, the way to do that is to pass the Bill to the second reading, and those who are opposed to the preamble can then have it struck out. The preamble of a private Bill is the all-essential portion; if the preamble be not carried, the Bill does not pass. The preamble of a public Bill is wholly unessential; its only possible use can be to make an ambiguous portion of the enacting clause plain, if ambiguity there be; and I say here that while I do not withdraw from that preamble, while I think the statement in it is perfectly true, namely:

"Whereas it is expedient in the interest of the national unity of the Dominion that there should be community of language among the people of Canada."

Who will say nay to that? It may not be absolutely essential; that is not the proposition. I say, it is expedient, and every gentleman who has spoken on this question has admitted its expediency. Even the hon. member for West Durham said that if we were all of one race and one nationality, speaking one tongue, the task before us would be simpler and easier, and, therefore, the proposition before us is not incorrect and unfounded. But to any hon. gentleman who objects to it, all I can say is, when the Bill goes to Com-

mittee, should it pass the second reading, let him object to the preamble, and I shall be the first to withdraw it. I want the body of the Bill, and do not care for the preamble, and if there be a member of this House who desires the Bill and objects to the preamble, there shall be no opposition, as far as I am concerned, to this preamble being obliterated, or expunged, to use any term you please. I will say more. I did not in the least dream that the words should be taken up in an offensive sense, and I can only most heartily express my regret that any of my French Canadian friends should be offended by this clause in the Bill, or that I should have hurt the sentiments of French speaking members of this House, or the French Canadians throughout the country—for such was far from my intention. But what was the proposition of the hon. member for West Assiniboia (Mr. Davin)? It was that the Bill be not now read a second time. That is, he does not want the dual language expunged, nor does he want to give the power to the North-West Territories to expunge it.

Mr. DAVIN. I do.

Mr. McCARTHY. Then the hon. gentleman has not taken the proper course. If he wanted that, his proper course was to let the Bill be read a second time, and to move into Committee that clause I be struck out and the words of his amendment inserted in its stead:

~~"That the said Bill be not now read a second time, but that it be resolved,—That it is expedient that the Legislative Assembly of the North-West Territories be authorised to deal with the subject-matter of this Bill by Ordinance or enactment after the next general election for the said Territories."~~

But the effect of the hon. gentleman's amendment is to kill the Bill. Make no mistake about it. If the Bill is not read a second time, there it stops. Then what takes place? Hon. gentlemen say they want to repeal the dual language clause, but they want to do that with as much gentleness and consideration for the feelings and susceptibilities of the French-speaking people as possible. Then, the way to do that is to pass the Bill, rejecting the preamble, and inserting the clause of the hon. member for West Assiniboia as the substantial part of the Bill. But if you say that the Bill do not pass, but that it be resolved, &c., and make that resolution as long as you please, what follows? Who is to move? The Government cannot move, for they are at sixes and sevens on this subject. There is the resolution. I certainly would not move it, as I do not approve of it. The hon. member for Assiniboia would not move it, because he would offend the powers that be.

Mr. DAVIN. I would move it if necessary.

Mr. McCARTHY. Does the hon. gentleman doubt the necessity?

Mr. DAVIN. No.

Mr. McCARTHY. Then I think the hon. gentleman would have to move, and instead of being the admired of all his surroundings, he will occupy the position I do. He will be belated and berated, and will fall from the highest stage or pinnacle of greatness which he has occupied for the last few days. Do not now rush in where angels fear to tread; and I do not think the hon. gentleman will make any such mistake. Why, let us not deal with this subject in a simple way. Punish me if you will; expel me if you please; because I

venture to put in this preamble, and to speak at the Opera House, and because I ventured to claim that the English language should rule in this country, but pass the Bill. The way to pass the Bill is to go to a second reading and then to expunge what is in the preamble. Do not pass the Bill, if it suits your pleasure, but vote the amendment of the hon. member for Berthier. That is honest and straightforward, and that, at all events, we can understand. We can understand the views and the policy of the hon. gentlemen who are absolutely opposed to any change. But hon. gentlemen who wish to get rid of this question by a side-issue, who try to do and not to do it, will not, although they may deceive this country. That they may depend upon. I listened to the argument of the hon. member for Kent (Mr. Landry), and I listened to the argument of my hon. friend from Rouville (Mr. Gigault), and no more straightforward or honorable statement of the case was given on that side of the House. It contrasted greatly with the statement from the Treasury benches of its compatriots from Quebec; it was arguments, not abuse. It was a reason for us to pause in our course, and was not simply denunciation of those who differ from the views which those hon. gentlemen both take. But I say their view is the correct view. It is this Parliament, and it is this Parliament alone, which has the power to deal with this question. It is this Parliament which put that clause in, uninvited. It is this Parliament which has the authority to take that clause out. Why should we abnegate our duties or our functions on the ground of expediency or to get rid of a temporary difficulty? Will we, in the interest of our country, be doing a service? Will we not be keeping open that burning sore of which the hon. gentleman from South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) spoke? We put the trouble on the people of the North-West, but, although we should denude ourselves of our authority and endeavor to get rid of this question for the moment, it will remain a burning question in old Canada and in the new Provinces, more especially, if you postpone the decision of this question until after the next general elections. I am commissioned to read the opinion of a senator who once occupied a seat in this House, and whose voice is now unable to be heard here.

Mr. DAVIN. Name.

Mr. McCARTHY. Senator Perley. His observations ought to have weight. Writing to me on the 12th February, he says:

"MY DEAR SIR.—Stand firm for your resolution re: dual language in the North-West Territories. The North-West is with you. I get letters by every mail strongly urging me to help you in this matter. Davin's amendment if carried might lead to serious results in some of the constituencies, only paralleled by the Hull affair of last night. Particulary might this be the case in those constituencies where it was stated by Mr. Bits, member of the Legislative Assembly, that so few of the people could read in any language and their prejudices so easily excited. I contend it is wrong to submit a question of such a character to the vote of the people. Discussion and electioneering talk on such an issue would tend to disturb the harmony and good-feeling that is fast being obtained between the people of different nationalities and creeds in the North-West Territories. I write this advisedly and with the full knowledge of the responsibility of a representative of the people in the North-West Territories from end to end."

"Yours, &c.,  
W. D. PERLEY."

Is not that reasonable? Is it reasonable, when we have this matter before us now—a matter which has excited, we are told, a great deal of feeling in this chamber, a matter which has excited a good deal of feeling out of doors, having opinions formed one way or the other about it, having a means of knowledge denied to the representatives of the North-West Territories, we, who have this great duty thrown upon us here, should refuse to discharge it and ask the unfortunate people of the North-West to have this bone of contention thrown upon them? That may be right from a party point of view; I venture to say it is not right from a statesman's point of view. This Bill may be wrong, it may be that the Bill ought to be rejected, but there can be no justification for sending it to the people of the North-West to be dealt with. I deny that I have gone back upon any views that I have advocated in regard to provincial rights. If the people of the North-West did not wish to have this measure passed, we might postpone it at the present time, but the people have shown that they are in favor of it, and every newspaper in the North-West—excepting always the *Regina Leader*—has spoken in favor of the abolition of the dual language. I cannot look upon the *Regina Leader*, as an authoritative representative of public opinion in the North-West. We know that the *Regina Leader* occupies a peculiar position in regard to the existing state of affairs in the North-West. I am told I may be wrong—I do not connect it with any hon. member of this House, but I am told that it was owing to the fact that the Lieutenant Governor of the North-West insisted upon giving to the *Regina Leader* the printing of that Government at a higher rate than it could be done for elsewhere, that the deadlock was brought about in the North-West Council, that the Lieutenant Governor's advisers refused to agree to that, and then resigned. Of course, the longer the dual language is preserved, the better it is for the publisher of the *Regina Leader*, and, therefore, I do not think that the *Regina Leader* is to be quoted as an authority on this question. Putting the *Regina Leader* aside, we have the unanimous opinion of the press of the North-West, as we have the opinion of the people of the North-West, that they do not want the dual language. Why should we pause? Why should we hesitate? I have done. I have endeavored to make my case as plain as I possibly can. I have endeavored to show why this question should be dealt with at the earliest possible moment. I have endeavored to show that it ought to be dealt with here. I have endeavored to show that, if this resolution which has been moved by the hon. member for West Assiniboia (Mr. Davin) is passed, that is the end of the Bill, but the end is not accomplished. I have stated that I am prepared, if any hon. gentleman objects to the recital in this Bill, that it shall be stricken out, and every hon. gentleman in this House knows that, when the Bill reaches committee, it can then be debated whether it is for us here or for the North-West to deal with this question; but, if the amendment of the hon. gentleman is carried, it is a way to do this little Bill to death, instead of its becoming the law of the land, which is the desire of the people in the North-West who have taken an interest in this matter, and I am sure is the desire of the great majority of the people of the country. The sooner this question is set at rest,

the better. It is a question which is calculated to distract us on a question of race cleavage. That alone should be a reason for dealing with the matter now. Does the House suppose that, if the Bill is defeated, whether upon the amendment of the hon. member for West Assiniboia (Mr. Davin) or upon the amendment of the hon. member for Berthier (Mr. Beausoleil), that would in any way end the question? Can any one imagine that, if I stand alone with my seconder in voting for this Bill, the same difficulties and troubles which certain hon. gentlemen profess to lament will not be brought up again? Is it not in the interest of the harmony and the good-will of the people of different nationalities that we should deal with this question here, this question which is now before us, and do they not suppose that we can deal with it in such a manner as to be as satisfactory to the people as if it were dealt with by the Council of the North-West? For myself, I may say that my political extinction has been prophesied by hon. gentlemen on both sides of the House. If that be my fate, in doing what I consider to be my duty, I shall cheerfully submit to it. I am acting simply according to my convictions, and not only as one hon. gentleman has suggested, because of the debate of the Jesuits' Estates Act. I wonder that that hon. gentleman should not have had better judgment than to introduce that question into

this debate. I have nothing to be ashamed of, I have nothing to lament in regard to the vote which I gave on the Jesuits' Estates Act. I did not prosecute any agitation on that subject afterwards, because I realised that the vote of this House in regard to it was conclusive; but it is not conducive to harmony in the party to which I did belong and to which, to a certain extent, I still belong, that an hon. gentleman should taunt me for the flimso which he says was the end of that matter. I have been taunted with the statement that I objected to the preamble of the Jesuits' Estates Act, and yet I was making nothing of the preamble to this Bill. There again the two matters are wholly and absolutely separate. In the Jesuits' Estates Act we had to take the Bill as it was, we had no power of amendment. It came to this House and it had either to be vetoed as it was, or allowed to go into operation as it was; whereas a Bill introduced into this House has to undergo the gauntlet of the first, second and third readings, of a consideration in committee, to be amended and improved to suit the opinions of the majority of the House. Therefore, there is nothing in common between the two cases. But, as I said before, those who voted with me on that question had nothing to regret, and I can only say that if a similar occasion arose again, I should not hesitate to repeat my vote.

---

Ottawa:—Printed by BROWN CHAMBERLIN, Printer to the Queen's Most Excellent Majesty.